



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/703,505	10/31/2000	Yishay Mor	50325-0500	2958

29989 7590 07/27/2006

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER

SAIN, GAUTAM

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/703,505

Applicant(s)

MOR, YISHAY

Examiner

Gautam Sain

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-7,9-16,18-22 and 32-84 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-7,9-16,18-22 and 32-84 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

- 1) This Non-Final Rejection is in response to the Remarks and new claims filed on 4/27/06.
- 2) Claims 1, 5-7, 9-16, 18-22 and 32-84 are pending.
- 3) Effective filing data is 10/31/2000.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 4-1) Claims 1, 5-7, 9-16, 18-22 and 32-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrison et al (US6611725, filed 9/25/00) in view of Lewallen (US 6675230, filed Aug 22, 2000).**

Regarding claims 1, 34, 51 and 68, Harrison teaches *an SVG statement associated with a graphical representation of the object*. For example, Harrison discloses a computer drawing system that includes accessing model data that is separately stored in documents detailing construction of a design model image (Abstract section), where a user can select an icon as an image element, using a pointer manipulated by a mouse input device in a vector image drawing software (col 7, lines 44-53; col 4, line 65 – col 5, line 12), using SVG vector image format (col 7, line 23).

Harrison teaches *binding to the SVG statements the pointer to the resource from an instance of the binding element*. For example, Harrison discloses using tag data to

Art Unit: 2176

create linkages between supplementary data and the 3D model image components to maintain associations between the supplementary data and the 3D model image (col 8, lines 13-17), implemented in the form of pointers (col 7, line 30).

Harrison does not expressly teach, but Lewallen teaches *creating and storing SVG statements in a SVG document that references a SVG document type definition file and inserting into the SVG document a reference to a second dtd file defining a binding element with an attribute for referencing a resource through a pointer, wherein the resource includes information pertaining to the object; and the resource is a database and the pointer includes a query for a data item in the database*. For example, Lewallen discloses a method for embedding a user interface object in another user interface object (see Title) with mapping of a SVG interface to a corresponding implementation of that object (col 3, lines 65-67), by transforming svg function calls with mixed statements to access objects (col 8, lines 55-65), where the mixed statements include function calls to perform queries to access data from a database to insert database records from the JDBC calls into the DOM for a displayed HTML page to display the returned data in the HTML page (col 9, lines 15-24), implemented using a style sheet (col 5, line 36-38). The examiner interprets the user of DOM elements and style sheets in Lewallen as equivalent to the claimed document type definition because the DOM allows a document component to be expressed in relationship of other objects along with its attributes (col 9, lines 45-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Harrison to include mapping svg statements with database queries to insert

database records into the DOM for a HTML page using style sheets as taught by Lewallen, providing the benefit of an improved platform to allow a first user interface program to include elements compatible with the first interface where the objects are embedded as elements in the first user interface (col 3, lines 30-45) in an SVG interface (col 8, line 60) to take advantage of the objects and interfaces available in different operating system platforms (col 3, lines 16-17).

Regarding claims 5, 13, 16, 35, 42, 52, 59, 69 and 76, Harrison teaches the object is one of a network device and a link between network devices. The examiner characterizes this limitation as any object in the SVG image and is reasonably interpreted as any drawn element in the image. For example, Harrison discloses a computer aided design system including vector drawing data elements (col 4, lines 63-66), where a user can draw various interconnected components (col 5, line 67 – col 6, line 5).

Harrison teaches the resource being a database of network device. For example, Harrison teaches a model that assembles various interconnected components in a design tree that shows the relationships of the components (col 5, line 65 – col 6, line 5).

Harrison teaches the pointer indicating a database element associated with the object. For example, Harrison discloses data associated with an image data element with pointers referencing a table with stored data (col 7, lines 30-27-33).

Regarding Claims 6, 36, 53 and 70, Harrison teaches *creating and storing additional SVG statements in the document, the additional statements associated with another*

graphical representation of another object and binding the additional SVG statements to an other pointer to the resource, wherein the resource includes additional information pertaining to the other object. For example, Harrison discloses a user adding supplementary data to the drawing document using annotations to image files, including notes, graphical symbols, which is linked to the structural component feature of the image model (col 7, lines 35-62).

Regarding Claims 7, 37, 54 and 71, Harrison teaches *extracting a-the pointer to a-the resource from a binding element in the document, the binding element associated with the SVG statements, determining whether a user has selected the graphical representation of the object, and if the user has selected the graphical representation, then using information in the resource based on the pointer.* For example, Harrison discloses using the displayed pointer by a mouse device, user selects image, which is then retrieved, which is equivalent to extracting (col 7, lines 40-57).

Harrison teaches *presenting a graphical representation of the object based on the scalable vector*

graphics (SVG) statements in a-the document. For example, the updated drawing document shows the updated image elements in the original drawing along with the supplementary data (col 8, lines 50-60).

Regarding Claims 9, 38, 55 and 72, Harrison teaches *determining whether a user has selected the graphical representation comprises determining whether a pointing device has placed a cursor over the area.* Harrison discloses using the displayed pointer by a

mouse pointer device, user selects image, which is then retrieved, where the user must place the mouser pointer over the selection region (col 7, lines 43-46).

Harrison does not expressly teach, but Lewallen teaches the method further comprises defining a style sheet, which maps an area on a display *associated with the graphical representation to a link including the pointer to the resource*. For example, Lewallen discloses, using a Cascading Style Sheet, on a browser, mapping of svg interface objects to display returned data in the image displayed in the web page (col 9, line 60; lines 15-25).

Regarding Claims 10, 39, 56 and 73, Harrison teaches *the method further comprises providing statements in at least one of a scripting language and a programming language, the statements mapping an area on a display associated with the graphical representation to a link including the pointer to the resource*. For example, Harrison discloses object –oriented programming language on the document)(col 9, line 50).

Harrison teaches *said determining whether a user has selected the graphical representation comprises determining whether a pointing device has placed a cursor over the area*. For example, Harrison discloses using the displayed pointer by a mouse pointer device, user selects image, which is then retrieved, where the user must place the mouser pointer over the selection region (col 7, lines 43-47).

Regarding Claims 11, 40, 57 and 74, Harrison teaches *using the information in the resource comprising displaying the information to the user*. For example, Harrison discloses 2D projected views on computer display screen using svg along with image elements (col 2, lines 16-40).

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding Claims 12, 41, 58 and 75, Harrison teaches *using the information in the resource comprising launching a separate application to operate on the resource based on the pointer*. For example, Harrison discloses upon selecting an element, the user activates a procedure allowing supplementary data to be input (col 7, lines 45-55).

Regarding Claims 14, 43, 60 and 77, Harrison teaches *retrieving e-the document wherein the scalable vector graphics (SVG) statements are associated with a first graphical representation of the object; retrieving information from the resource based on the pointer*. For example, Harrison discloses accessing and editing documents for model documents (col 2, summary section). Harrison discloses pointers (col 7, line 30).

Harrison teaches *extracting a-the pointer to a-the resource from a binding element in the document, the binding element associated with the SVG statements*. For example, Harrison discloses using the displayed pointer by a mouse device, user selects image, which is then retrieved, which is equivalent to extracting (col 7, lines 40-57).

Harrison teaches *modifying the SVG statements based on the information*. For example, Harrison discloses editing data including image elements (col 4, lines 62-66). Harrison teaches *presenting a second graphical representation of the object based on the SVG statements after said modifying*. For example, Harrison discloses that once the editing/modifying of a drawing is complete, then the files are processed to generate the drawing documents (col 4, line 62 – col 5, line 11).

Regarding Claims 15, 44, 61 and 78, Harrison teaches *the second graphical representation indicates the current status of the object*. For example, Harrison

discloses as parametric data associated with object is displayed for a model, that is the current detail of the components (col 7, lines 59-67).

Regarding Claims 18, 46, 63 and 80, Harrison teaches *inserting an anchor for a hyperlink to another resource*. For example, Harrison discloses hyperlink (col 7, line 25).

Harrison teaches *inserting the second graphical representation of the object into the anchor*. Harrison discloses after generation of document, having the user add supplementary data added to the drawing file (col 7, lines 35-40).

Regarding Claims 19, 47, 64 and 81, Harrison teaches *modifying the SVG statements further comprising including in the hyperlink at least a portion of the information retrieved from the resource based on the pointer*. For example, Harrison discloses inserting parameter data as hyperlink associated with image data (col 7, lines 20-30).

Regarding Claims 20, 48, 65 and 82, Harrison teaches a *second graphical representation is the same as the first graphical representation*. For example, Harrison discloses that after the supplementary data is added to the drawing document and is rendered to terminal, which is equivalent as 1st document that is rendered (col 7, lines 35-45) and the document can be updated without any supplement data attached to it (col 8, lines 49-55).

Regarding Claims 21, 49, 66 and 83, Harrison teaches *modifying the SVG statements further comprising removing the binding element from the SVG statements*. For example, transferring and deleting components from the drawing (col 8, lines 61-67).

Regarding Claims 22, 50, 67 and 84, Harrison teaches modifying the SVG statements further *comprising removing the SVG statements that form the first graphical representation of the object*. For example, Harrison discloses transferring, deleting from the original drawing document (col 8, lines 61-67).

Regarding claims 32 and 33, Harrison teaches extracting a value from the attribute of the instance of the binding element for referencing a resource through a pointer. For example, Harrison discloses SVG foreign namespace and/or private data that can be associated with an image data element in the form of comments, pointers or other data types, where each element has a simple identifier referencing a table in which parametric data is stored (col 7, lines 26-33).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4/27/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding claim 1, the Applicant argues that the cited references do not teach binding element with an attribute for referencing a resource through a pointer (see Remarks, page 20). The examiner disagrees. Harrison discloses using tag data to create linkages between supplementary data and the 3D model image components to maintain associations between the supplementary data and the 3D model image (col 8, lines 13-17), implemented in the form of pointers (col 7, line 30). The examiner equates Harrison's linking as equivalent to the claimed binding. The examiner interprets the user of DOM elements and style sheets in Lewallen as equivalent to the claimed document type definition because the DOM allows a document component to be expressed in relationship of other objects along with it's attributes (col 9, lines 45-55).

Applicant argues that the cited references do not show a pointer including a query for a data item in a database (Remarks, page 22, middle). The examiner disagrees. Lewallen discloses mixed statements that include function calls to perform queries to access data from a database to insert database records from the JDBC calls into the DOM for a displayed HTML page to display the returned data in the HTML page (col 9, lines 15-24).

Applicant argues that there is no motivation to combine Harrison with the other references including Lewallen (Remarks, page 23, middle). The examiner disagrees, because it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Harrison to include mapping svg statements with database queries to insert database records into the DOM for a HTML page using style sheets as taught by Lewallen, providing the benefit of an improved platform to allow a first user interface program to include elements compatible with the first interface where the objects are embedded as elements in the first user interface (col 3, lines 30-45) in an SVG interface (col 8, line 60) to take advantage of the objects and interfaces available in different operating system platforms (col 3, lines 16-17). Additionally, Harrison and Lewallen both teach using a SVG interface for elements/objects/components that are linked to more data about the elements/objects/components in another location (ie., a database or other document)(as consistent with the applicant's specification as seen in Fig 1, item 120, 122).

Applicant argues that Lewallen does not suggest the claimed invention merely because Lewallen merely cites the keywords "svg", "query" and "database". The

Examiner disagrees that Lewallen *merely* cites the keywords. The Lewallen reference, in fact, teaches and/or suggests certain claimed portions of the invention. Specifically, Lewallen teaches *creating and storing SVG statements in a SVG document that references a SVG document type definition file and inserting into the SVG document a reference to a second dtd file defining a binding element with an attribute for referencing a resource through a pointer, wherein the resource includes information pertaining to the object; and the resource is a database and the pointer includes a query for a data item in the database*. For example, Lewallen discloses a method for embedding a user interface object in another user interface object (see Title) with mapping of a SVG interface to a corresponding implementation of that object (col 3, lines 65-67), by transforming svg function calls with mixed statements to access objects (col 8, lines 55-65), where the mixed statements include function calls to perform queries to access data from a database to insert database records from the JDBC calls into the DOM for a displayed HTML page to display the returned data in the HTML page (col 9, lines 15-24), implemented using a style sheet (col 5, line 36-38). The examiner interprets the user of DOM elements and style sheets in Lewallen as equivalent to the claimed document type definition because the DOM allows a document component to be expressed in relationship of other objects along with it's attributes (col 9, lines 45-55).


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 571-272-4096. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

GS 7/24/6
GS


HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100